DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 713 EA 001 923

By-Bowman, Garda W.; Klopf, Gordon J.

Auxiliary School Personnel: Their Roles, Training, and Institutionalization, Based on a Nationwide Study of Teacher-Aides, Teacher-Assistants, Family Workers, and other Auxiliary Personnel in Education, Conducted for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Bank Street Coll. of Education, New York, N.Y.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Oct 66
Note-22p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.20
Descriptors-Culturally Disadvantaged, Higher Education, *Paraprofessional School Personnel, *Problems, Program Development, Role Perception, *School Aides, *Teacher Aides, Teaching Conditions, *Training

The employment of teacher aides, guidance aides, family workers, and other auxiliary school personnel has increased sharply, but preparation for such new programs has not kept pace. Advantages of using auxiliary personnel in school systems include (1) more individual attention for students, (2) improved teaching conditions with more teacher time for professional duties, (3) easing of the shortage of professionals, and (4) provision of a means by which unemployed and educationally disadvantaged persons may enter the mainstream of productivity. Difficulties which might arise for administrators, principals, teachers, and auxiliaries in the deployment of auxiliary personnel range from problems of job titles, salaries, and training requirements to concern for professional standards and the limited backgrounds of most auxiliaries. Recommendations concerning the development and use of auxiliaries include (1) that role specifications and prerogatives of auxiliaries be clearly defined, (2) that there be preservice training to develop communication and job skills, (3) that there be a continuing inservice training program, (4) that cooperation of community colleges be sought for training auxiliaries, and (5) that use of auxiliary personnel be institutionalized into a program offering job security and being an integral part of the school. (TT)

AUXILIARY SCHOOL PERSONNEL:
THEIR ROLES,
TRAINING,
AND INSTITUTIONALIZATION,

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BASED ON A NATIONWIDE STUDY OF TEACHER-AIDES, TEACHER-ASSISTANTS, FAMILY WORKERS, AND OTHER AUXILIARY PERSONNEL IN EDUCATION

by Garda W. Bowman and Gordon J. Klopf

Conducted for the Office of Economic Opportunity

By Bank Street College of Education
103 East 125th Street
New York, New York 10035

OCTOBER, 1966

EA 001 923

P R E F A C E

Bank Street College of Education is conducting a study of auxiliary school personnel for the Office of Economic Opportunity. This document, "Auxiliary School Personnel: Their Roles, Training and Institutionalization," is prepared in response to the many requests for information received by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the U. S. Office of Education. The content is based on observations made from visits to eleven of the fifteen demonstration training programs participating in the Study and on consultations with representatives of professional organizations and school systems. Profiles of the eleven programs which operated during the summer of 1966 and other supplementary materials may be available in mid-winter, 1966. A final report, including the findings from the empirical data, will be issued in the spring, 1967.

The College appreciates the cooperation of the participating institutions and school systems, and is grateful for the guidance of the consultants and advisers who have given so generously of their time and professional wisdom.

John H. Niemeyer
President
Bank Street
College of
Education

AUXILIARY SCHOOL PERSONNEL: THEIR ROLES, TRAINING, AND INSTITUTIONALIZATION

The employment of teacher-aides, teacher-assistants, guidance-aides, health-aides, family workers and other auxiliary personnel in schools increased sharply during the mid-sixties. Often, however, the circumstances under which funds could be secured as well as the urgency of the need required a crash program. The essential component of preparation was therefore lacking -- preparation not only of the nonprofessional themselves but even more importantly, of the teachers and other professionals with whom they would be working.

Several convergent forces -- social, educational and economic -- have contributed to the mushrooming of such employment at a pace which sometimes precluded adequate orientation:

1. The ever changing and expanding needs for school services;
2. Acute shortages of professionals to meet these needs;
3. New dimensions in education, requiring a more complex and demanding role for teachers;
4. Heightened awareness of the special learning needs of disadvantaged children and youth;
5. Recognition of the communication blocks which often exist between middle class professionals and lower class pupils;
6. The plight of undereducated persons unable to compete in an increasingly automated economy;
7. The availability of Federal funds for the employment of low income nonprofessionals in education, through such sources as O.E.O., M.D.T.A. and Title I of the E.S.E.A.

The U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity, alert to this critical situation, requested Bank Street College of Education to conduct a study of auxiliary personnel in education. This study, exploratory and developmental in nature, has three specific areas of inquiry: role development, training, and institutionalization of auxiliaries in school systems. One component of the study was the coordination and analysis of 15 demonstration training programs[1], 11 of which were conducted during the summer of 1966. The other four started in September, 1966. In these programs professionals and nonprofessionals studied and worked together to increase the effectiveness of auxiliary personnel in various school situations.

The auxiliaries learned specific skills and gained some basic understandings needed to operate in a school setting. The teacher-trainees learned in a reality situations -- a practicum -- how to utilize and relate to other adults in a classroom.

The auxiliary trainees in the Summer Institutes included Navaho Indians from a reservation; low income whites from Appalachia; Mexican-Americans and Negroes in California; predominantly Negroes in Gary, Indiana, in Jackson, Mississippi, and in Detroit; mothers receiving aid to dependent children in Maine; Puerto Ricans, Negroes and others in East Harlem; Puerto Ricans in disadvantaged sections of Metropolitan San Juan; and a cross-cultural, cross-class group of trainees in Boston.

The varied experiences of the demonstration programs will be described and analyzed in some depth in the final report of the study which is due early in 1967. Meantime, this brochure considers what seems to help or harm effective utilization of auxiliary personnel in education. It offers: (1) a rationale for the use of

---

[1] See list of projects on page 15.

auxiliaries in school systems; (2) some difficulties which might be encountered; and (3) some recommendations for coping with these difficulties, based on the experience thus far in the demonstration training programs.

It is expected that the demonstration programs may have some relevance to other school situations where auxiliary personnel are employed or are about to be employed. Further, this report may elicit comments and counter-suggestions which will contribute to the exploration of a new and promising development in education.

RATIONALE FOR THE UTILIZATION OF AUXILIARY PERSONNEL IN SCHOOL SYSTEMS

The question is often asked: "Should the school system be required to solve all the social problems of our time?" This leads to a second question: "Is the utilization of low income workers as auxiliary school personnel aimed primarily at creating jobs for the poor, at coping with acute manpower shortage, or at helping to meet the needs of pupils?"

To those who conducted demonstration training programs during the summer of 1966 the answer appeared to be that the essential criterion of any innovation in education is whether it helps to meet the learning and developmental needs of children and youth. However, they believed that the learning-teaching process can be truly effective only in relation to the totality of the child's experience. The school, like every other institution, operates within a social context, not in isolation.

The sponsors of the demonstration programs believed that even if there were no shortage of teachers, the introduction of more adults into the classroom would enhance the quality of education -- adults selected on the basis of their concern for children and their potential as supportive personnel rather than primarily on the basis of previous training. They saw, too, great possibilities in the professional - nonprofessional team in enabling the teacher to differentiate the learning-teaching process to meet the individual needs of pupils, as diagnosed by the teacher. They saw, too, in this multi-level team approach escape from rigid structuring in the classroom -- for example, more freedom of movement, more small groupings, more independent activities than would be feasible for one teacher, often operating under difficult teaching conditions. In fact, the teacher might, with this assistance, be able to experiment with innovative techniques which he had long been wanting to inaugurate.

These values are universal -- that is to say, they might be realized through the effective utilization of auxiliaries in any classroom regardless of the composition of the school population or the socio-economic background of the auxiliaries. The proponents of this new development in education saw the possibility of multiple benefits, in all school situations, such as:

1. To the pupil, by providing more individualized attention by concerned adults, more mobility in the classroom, and more opportunity for innovation;
2. To the teacher, by rendering his role more satisfying in terms of status, and more manageable in terms of teaching conditions;
3. To the other professionals, by increasing the scope and effectiveness of their activities;
4. To the auxiliary, by providing meaningful employment which contributes at one and the same time to his own development and to the needs of society;
5. To the school administrator, by providing some answers to his dilemma of ever increasing needs for school services, coupled with shortage of professionals to meet these needs -- a solution, not the solution, and certainly not a panacea;
6. To family life, by giving auxiliaries, many of whom are or may someday become parents, the opportunity to learn child development principles in a reality situation;
7. To the community at large, by providing a means through which unemployed and educationally disadvantaged persons may enter the mainstream of productivity.

In addition to these global considerations, there are some specific benefits which may flow from the utilization of indigenous personnel as auxiliaries in schools serving disadvantaged neighborhoods.

The auxiliary who has actually lived in disadvantaged environments often speaks to the disadvantaged child or youth in a way that is neither strange nor

threatening. He may help the new pupil to adjust to the unfamiliar world of the school without undue defensiveness; to fill the gaps, if any, in his preparation for learning; and to build upon his strengths, which may have more relevance to the new situation than the child, himself, realizes. This cultural bridge is seen as an asset, in and of itself, even if there were no need to provide jobs for the poor.

Moreover, the low-income auxiliary, having faced up to and overcome some of the difficulties and frustrations the children now face, may serve to motivate the child to further effort. His very presence in a role of some status in the school says to the child: "It can be done; it is worth trying to do; you, too, can succeed here." This has far more meaning than the story of a Ralph Bunche or a Felicia Rincon de Gautier to one who obviously lacks the exceptional ability of these great but remote persons.

Naturally, this message would be imparted more forcefully if the faculty, too, were mixed in terms of socio-economic background. As work-study programs become increasingly available, economic integration may become more frequent in school faculties. Meantime, the low-income auxiliary sometimes provides incentive to poor pupils which would otherwise be lacking.

Further, the auxiliary from the child's own neighborhood may be able to interpret to the middle class professional some aspects of the behavior of a child who is non-responding in a school situation. The auxiliary may, in turn, interpret the goals of the school and the learning-teaching process to both parent and child. To reach the child for a few hours a day without reaching those who influence his mode of living may be of little avail. The parent who doesn't understand a school official sometimes finds a neighbor serving as a school auxiliary helpful.

However, the fact that low-income auxiliaries may and often do facilitate communication between school and community does not mean that all poor people can work effectively with poor pupils and their families. Naturally, any candidate for school employment should be carefully screened for those personal characteristics needed to work with children and youth. However, the demonstration programs have revealed that a flexible and imaginative selection process may discover in poor people potential that has been overlooked thus far -- potential which may be developed as an asset in a school setting.

In summary, new dimensions in education call for the utilization of school personnel of various socio-economic backgrounds and at various levels of training working together as teams to meet the wide range of pupil needs in changing communities. Since economic, social and educational problems often have some common causal factors, a single solution may have multiple values. It may result in positive pupil outcomes and in socially useful outcomes as well. The utilization of low-income auxiliaries in disadvantaged areas appears to be a case in point. Its possibilities are many. Its real significance is only beginning to be explored.

The study is designed to view these possibilities in terms of several reality situations, and to identify factors which seem to block or facilitate the realization of educational values from the utilization of auxiliaries in these specific situations.

DIFFICULTIES WHICH MIGHT ARISE IN THE DEPLOYMENT OF AUXILIARIES IN SCHOOLS

During the pre-planning for the overall study and for the demonstration programs, many professional and administrative concerns were discussed. Some of the anticipated difficulties were actually encountered. Others proved to be mere conjecture, not substantiated by experience. The fact that these possible problems had been considered in advance aided in their solution.

The difficulties anticipated by each of the groups involved in the training programs differed widely. For school administrators they were largely "how to" problems, such as establishing fiscal policies -- the whole process of setting up a new hierarchy of positions, with job descriptions, job titles, salaries, increments, role prerogatives and training requirements for advancement. Another "how to" problem for the superintendent was orienting the principals, who, in turn were faced with the problem of interpreting the new program to the teachers and other professionals so that they would utilize rather than ignore, reject, or resent their would-be helpers. Theirs was the task to determine who would conduct the training of both professionals and nonprofessionals and how to secure such personnel. Often all this had to be accomplished within and in spite of institutional rigidities. Moreover, the school administrator was responsible for involving local institutions of higher learning and the indigenous leadership in the planning, and for interpreting the new program to the Board and to the broader community.

The professionals -- teachers, supervisors, guidance counselors, et al -- were primarily concerned that professional standards should be maintained. They wondered whether the auxiliaries might try to "take over", but they were even more concerned lest the administrators, caught in the bind between increasing enrollment

and decreasing availability of professional personnel, might assign functions to the auxiliaries that were essentially professional in nature. The teachers, specifically, believed that teacher-aides might sometimes be assigned to a class without the supervision of a certified professional. Teachers, particularly, questioned whether funds which might have been used to reduce the teaching load would be used instead to employ auxiliaries, while increasing rather than decreasing the size of classes.

Teachers and other professionals also doubted that adequate time would be set aside during school hours for planning and evaluating with the auxiliaries assigned to them. Moreover, many professionals were not accustomed to the new leadership function which they were being asked to perform. Some felt threatened by another adult in the classroom. Others could not envision ways in which to use this new source of assistance effectively. Still others anticipated that the auxiliaries might not speak in standard English and hence might undermine their own efforts to improve the pupils' language skills. A few wondered whether the pupils would respond more easily to the auxiliaries than to themselves and that they might therefore lose close, personal contacts with their pupils.

The auxiliaries, themselves, had many trepidations. They, too, appeared to be concerned about the differences in their background, values, and patterns of speech from those prevailing in the school. While the professionals often considered the effects of such factors upon pupils, the auxiliaries tended to become defensive and uncomfortable because of these differences. On the other hand, some auxiliaries were resentful, particularly in pre-school centers, when they observed only the end result of the planning -- i.e. what was actually done for pupils and by whom in the classroom. Not understanding the diagnostic skills required of the

teacher in designing the program to meet the needs of individual pupils, these auxiliaries were heard to say: "We do the same things as the teachers; why should they be paid more?"

It became evident that the problem of defining and redefining one's own role was only one aspect of the challenge. An even more important task was defining, understanding and accepting the role of the person with whom one was to work. This was equally true of professionals and auxiliaries as they entered into a new, sensitive and complex relationship. In fact, one of the insights gained from the demonstration programs was that many of the doubts and concerns could have been avoided if there had been adequate specification of roles and functions prior to the operation.

In those programs where these possible difficulties were discussed by school administrators, university representatives and community leaders in pre-planning sessions, the problems were either ameliorated or prevented. Usually, only the unexpected proves disastrous.

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

In essence, the experiences in the 11 demonstration programs which were operating during the summer of 1966 seemed to indicate that it is not likely that the desired outcomes from the utilization of auxiliary personnel in a given school situation would be realized unless certain pre-conditions to their use were established, so as to avoid or resolve some of the difficulties listed in the preceding section.

Specific recommendations are presented below, based on the experiences, thus far, in role development and training demonstrations. The recommendations refer to all types of auxiliaries, not merely to those from low-income groups.

1. Role Definition and Development

...That role specifications and prerogatives of auxiliaries be clearly defined, in order to prevent either their underutilization by unconvinced professionals, or their overutilization by harried administrators faced by manpower shortages.

...That the functions of individual auxiliaries and of the professionals with whom they work be developed reciprocally in terms of the dynamics of each specific situation.

...That role definition, which gives security, be balanced with role development, which gives variety and scope to the program.

...That the whole range of teaching functions be re-examined, so as to identify those which might be performed by nonprofessionals, such as monitorial, escorting, technical, clerical, and the more important functions directly related to instruction and to home-school relations.

...That teaching functions be further examined to identify the more complex and highly professional functions which should be performed by a teacher alone, such as diagnosis of the learning needs of pupils, planning programs to meet these needs, and orchestrating other adults in the classroom in the execution of such programs.

2. Training

a) Preservice:

...That there be preservice training of auxiliaries to develop communication skills and other concrete skills as well as the basic understandings needed for success during their first work experience, thus bolstering self confidence and encouraging further effort.

...That the training be differentiated to meet the special needs and characteristics of each group, considering such variables as the age of the trainees and the levels (elementary, middle or secondary) at which they are being trained to work.

...That there be orientation of both the administrators and the professionals with whom the auxiliaries will be working, including an opportunity for the expression of any doubts or fears which may exist, and for consideration of the new and challenging leadership role of the professionals vis-a-vis the nonprofessionals.

...That institutes for administrators, teachers and auxiliaries be conducted, where a common approach to collaborative education can be developed.

...That a practicum be included in all preservice training -- i.e. a field teaching experience where professionals and nonprofessionals try out and evaluate their team approach, under the close supervision of the training staff.

...That training of trainers and supervisors be provided.

b) Inservice:

...That there be a comprehensive, continuing, in-depth program of development and supervision of auxiliaries closely integrated with a long term program of stable, open-ended employment, so that each level of work responsibility will have comparable training available.

...That mechanisms for process observations and feed-back be developed with a spirit of openness to suggestion so that dynamic role

concepts and relationships may emerge which are relevant to each specific situation.

c) Higher education:

...That the cooperation of 2-year and community colleges be sought in the development of programs for auxiliaries who would move into roles requiring more knowledge and skills than at the entry level; for example, library-aides might have one or two years' training in the librarian's role.

...That the cooperation of colleges of teacher education and departments of education in institutions of higher learning be sought in two respects, first by providing educational opportunities for auxiliaries who desire to qualify for advancement to the professional level, and second by incorporating into their curricula the expanded role concept of the teacher in collaborative education.

Since the demonstration programs conducted during the summer of 1966 were primarily for purposes of role development and training, the third focus of the study -- institutionalization -- was not a component of these demonstrations except in the programs conducted by school systems: Detroit, Puerto Rico, and Gary, Indiana. However, in every training program, the need for institutionalization was stressed by staff and participants alike. They believed that the anticipated benefits had been realized in their training experience, but they also believed that training for jobs that were not stable or at best dead-end would be frustrating to the participants. The following recommendations on institutionalization are, in effect, a look into the future rather than a look backwards at the Summer Institutes

They represent the needed developments, as perceived by innovators in this field, for the optimum effectiveness of auxiliary personnel in American education.

3. Institutionalization

...That when and if a school system decides to utilize auxiliary personnel, the program be incorporated as an integral part of the school system, not treated as an extraneous adjunct to the system.

...That goals be thought through carefully, stated clearly, and implemented by means of definite procedures.

...That there be cooperative planning by the school systems, local institutions of higher learning and the indigenous leadership of the community served by the schools, both before the program has been inaugurated and after it has been institutionalized.

...That each step on the career ladder be specified in terms of functions salaries, increments and role prerogatives, moving from routine functions at the entry level to functions which are more responsible and more directly related to the learning-teaching process.

...That professional standards be preserved and that all tasks performed by an auxiliary be supervised by a teacher.

...That encouragement of those who desire to train and qualify for advancement be expressed in such a way that others who prefer to remain at the entry level feel no lack of job satisfaction, status, and recognition of the worth of their services -- in other words, that there should be opportunity but not compulsion for upward mobility.

...That time be scheduled during the school day or after school hours with extra compensation[2] for teachers and auxiliaries and other professional - nonprofessional teams to evaluate their experiences and plan together for the coming day.

...That the quantity and quality of supervision be re-examined in the light of the needs of this program.

...That the personal needs and concerns of both professionals and auxiliaries be dealt with in counseling sessions as they adjust to a new and sometimes threatening situation.

...That parents be involved in the program both as auxiliaries and as recipients of the services of family workers.

...That contacts be established with professional groups.

...That a continuing program of interpretation among educators and to the broader community be developed, with emphasis upon feed-back as well as imparting information.

...That an advisory committee of school administrators, supervisors, teachers, auxiliaries, parents, community leaders and university consultants be established to evaluate and improve the utilization of auxiliaries in each school where such a program is undertaken.

---

[2] This arrangement would vary according to the pattern established in each school system.

LIST OF DEMONSTRATION TRAINING PROGRAMS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY OF AUXILIARY PERSONNEL IN EDUCATION

- A PROJECT IN THE PREPARATION OF AUXILIARY SCHOOL PERSONNEL
  Ball State University
  Muncie, Indiana
  Richard Alexander, Director

- TEACHER EDUCATION AND PARENT-TEACHER AIDES IN A CULTURALLY DIFFERENT COMMUNITY*
  Berkeley Unified School District
  Berkeley, California
  Jerome Gilbert, Director

- PILOT PROGRAM TO TRAIN TEACHER-AIDES
  Detroit Public Schools
  Division of Special Projects
  Detroit, Michigan
  Martin Kalish, Director

- AN INTEGRATED TRAINING INSTITUTE FOR AUXILIARY PERSONNEL IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION
  Garland Junior College
  Boston, Massachusetts
  Vera C. Weisz, Director

- THE COMMUNITY TESTING OF AN EXPERIMENTAL TRAINING MODEL: THE NEW CAREERS TRAINING PROJECT*
  Institute for Youth and Community Studies
  Howard University
  Washington, D.C.
  William H. Denham, Director

- A COMBINATION THEORY-ACTION INSTITUTE FOR THE SIMULTANEOUS TRAINING OF TEACHERS AND AUXILIARY PERSONNEL FOR EFFECTIVE SERVICE IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS OF THE CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED IN MISSISSIPPI
  Jackson State College
  Jackson, Mississippi
  Lottie Thornton, Director

- A PROJECT TO TRAIN TEACHER-AIDES
  New York University
  School of Education
  New York, New York
  Harold Robbins, Director

* Started in September, 1966

- A DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FOR THE PREPARATION OF AUXILIARY SCHOOL PERSONNEL IN COOPERATION WITH AN NDEA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY FOR THE TRAINING OF ADMINISTRATORS AND TEACHERS TO WORK WITH DISADVANTAGED NAVAHO CHILDREN
  Northern Arizona University
  College of Education
  Flagstaff, Arizona — John L. Gray, Director

- A PROJECT TO TRAIN TEENAGE YOUTH AS TEACHER-AIDES TO WORK WITH PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN IN APPALACHIA AND HELP UNIVERSITY STUDENTS TO PERCEIVE THEIR FUNCTION.
  Ohio University
  Athens, Ohio — Albert Leep, Director

- A PROJECT TO PREPARE TEACHER-AIDES FOR WORKING WITH DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN
  Department of Instruction
  San Juan Regional Office
  Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico — Ramon Cruz, Director

- A PROJECT TO TRAIN AND DEMONSTRATE THE ROLE OF NONPROFESSIONALS IN EDUCATION
  University of California Extension
  University of California
  Riverside, California — James R. Hartley, Director

- A PROJECT TO TRAIN AUXILIARY SCHOOL PERSONNEL (TEACHER-AIDES) IN CONNECTION WITH NDEA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY FOR TEACHERS OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN
  University of Maine
  Orono, Maine — John Lindlof, Director

- TEACHER-ASSISTANT TRAINING PROGRAM FOR HEAD START PROJECT
  O. E. O. Training and Development Center
  San Fernando Valley State College
  Northridge, California — Donald R. Thomas, Director

- A PROJECT TO TRAIN MIGRANTS FOR NONPROFESSIONAL JOBS (TEACHER-AIDES)*
  University of South Florida
  Center for Continuing Education
  St. Petersburg, Florida — Darrell Erickson, Director

- A PROGRAM TO TRAIN AUXILIARY AIDE SCHOOL PERSONNEL AS FAMILY AIDES*
  University of Southern Illinois
  Delinquency Study and Youth Development Project
  Edwardsville, Illinois — Naomi Le B. Naylor, Director

* Started in September, 1966

ADVISORY COMMISSION

Bruce Biddle	- Professor of Psychology and Sociology Director, Center for Research in Social Behavior University of Missouri
Brenda Bluearm Bohers	- Teacher Aide, Head Start Program Dupree, South Dakota
Morris Cogan	- Chairman, Education Department University of Pittsburgh
Charles Cogen	- President, American Federation of Teachers
Gladys Collins	- Chairman, Department of Elementary Education and Professor of Education Virginia State College
Don Davies	- Executive Secretary, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards National Education Association
William Ellena	- Associate Secretary, American Association of School Administrators, National Education Association
Mario Fantini	- Program Associate, Fund for the Advancement of Education The Ford Foundation
Ira Gordon	- Professor and Chairman, Foundations of Education University of Florida
Lassar Gotkin	- Senior Research Scientist, Institute for Developmental Studies School of Education New York University
Martin Haberman	- Professor of Education University of Wisconsin
Harold Haizlip	- Associate Director of Education Planning and Applied Social Research, Xerox Corporation
William Klein	- Assistant Director for Training Institute for Youth Studies Howard University
Taimi Lahti	- Assistant Executive Secretary Department of Classroom Teachers National Education Association

Richard Lawrence	-	Associate Executive Secretary American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education National Education Association
Angel Quintera-Aspera	-	Secretary of Education Department of Instruction Commonwealth of Puerto Rico
Frank Riessman	-	Professor of Educational Sociology New York University
Jerome Sachs	-	President Illinois Teachers College Chicago - North
Daniel Schreiber	-	Assistant Superintendent for Education of the Disadvantaged New York City Board of Education
Patricia Cayo Sexton	-	Associate Professor of Educational Sociology New York University
J. Lloyd Trump	-	Associate Secretary National Association of Secondary School Principals National Education Association
Verona L. Williams	-	School Aide, P. S. 1, Manhattan New York City Public School System
Charlotte Winsor	-	Vice-President for Planning Bank Street College of Education
Samuel Levine	-	Director Bureau of Educational Research San Francisco State College

STAFF OF THE STUDY OF AUXILIARY PERSONNEL IN EDUCATION

Gordon J. Klopf	Director
Garda W. Bowman	Research and Program Coordinator
Lodema Burrows	Editorial Associate
Jane Wagner	Editorial Associate
Diana Cook	Research Assistant
Dora Hershon	Research Assistant
Ruth Jutson	Research Assistant
Leontine Zimiles	Research Assistant
Marguerite Manning	Administrative Assistant

CONSULTANTS TO THE STUDY

Esin Kaya	Associate Professor of Educational Administration New York University
Barry Smith	Research Fellow, Department of Psychology University of Massachusetts
James Collins	Assistant Professor of Education and Coordinator of Laboratory Experiences University of Maryland

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D. C.